<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been further carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 12, 2008. Claims 1 to 10 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 have been amended and are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The independent claims have been amended to further clarify the features of the second circuit. Specifically, the independent claims further clarify that the second circuit determines whether information currently latched by a first circuit is the same as information latched by the first circuit a previous time, thereby determining whether or not the currently latched information matches a predetermined protocol. If it is determined that the information currently latched by the first circuit is the same as the information latched by the first circuit the previous time, the second circuit determines that the information currently latched by the first circuit does not match the predetermined protocol and therefore skips processing of the currently latched information. On the other hand, if it is determined that the information currently latched by the first circuit is not the same as the information latched by the first circuit the previous time, the second circuit determines that the information currently latched by the first circuit matches the predetermined protocol and therefore outputs the currently latched information to be processed.

The above-described features of the second circuit are not seen to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

As previously discussed in the December 12, 2008 Amendment, Wakasugi is seen to disclose that an internal strobe signal is asserted after a predetermined time has passed. See Wakasugi, Column 10, lines 45 to 49. More specifically, after a change in

input data, Wakasugi waits until the data is no longer changing to shift to a "settling state", and then starts a counter for counting a predetermined time. If the counter reaches a predetermined value without any further changes in the input data, the internal strobe signal is asserted to latch the data. See Wakasugi, Column 10, line 61 to Column 11, line 12.

However, Wakasugi is not seen to disclose or suggest a second circuit for determining whether information currently latched by a first circuit is the same as information latched by the first circuit a previous time, thereby determining whether or not the currently latched information matches a predetermined protocol, wherein in the second circuit, if it is determined that the information currently latched by the first circuit is the same as the information latched by the first circuit the previous time, the second circuit determines that the information currently latched by the first circuit does not match the predetermined protocol and therefore skips processing of the currently latched information, and wherein in the second circuit, if it is determined that the information currently latched by the first circuit is not the same as the information latched by the first circuit the previous time, the second circuit determines that the information currently latched by the first circuit matches the predetermined protocol and therefore outputs the currently latched information to be processed.

Motoyama is also not seen to disclose or suggest a second circuit of the present claims. More specifically, in Motoyama, it is judged whether or not a protocol identifier exists, and, it is then judged, if the protocol identifier exists, whether or not an actual format of subsequent data is correct based on format data corresponding to the relevant protocol identifier. Here, in Motoyama, if the format data matches the subsequent

data, it is judged that the data matches a protocol. On the other hand, according to the present claims, if information currently latched by a first circuit is not the same as information latched by the first circuit a previous time, a second circuit determines that the information currently latched by the first circuit matches a predetermined protocol.

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1, 5, 6, and 10, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____
Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746